

Serial No. 10/670,502

Attorney Docket No. 26A-010

REMARKS

The applicants acknowledge and appreciate receiving an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 that was filed on 11 October 2005.

Claims 21 – 31 are pending. Claims 1 – 5, 11 and 15 – 17 have been canceled by way of the above amendment. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 – 4, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,628,944, Nagasaka et al. ("Nagasaka"). Claims 5, 16, 17 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaka in view of various other references. Because claims 1 – 5, 11 and 15 – 17 are canceled, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot.

Claims 21, 22, 24 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,743,417, Bakkelunn ("Bakkelunn"). Independent claim 21 has been amended. Support for the amendment is located in the specification, for example, page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 7. The rejection is respectfully traversed for reasons including the following, which are provided by way of example.

Independent claim 21 recites, in combination, for example, forming a releasing agent layer on a wall surface of a cavity of a mold. In the forming step, a first liquid containing a releasing agent and a solvent is injected in the cavity and the cavity is depressurized while the mold is closed. The depressurization causes boiling and vaporization of the solvent and formation of a releasing agent layer on the wall surface of the cavity. (E.g., page 11, lines 9 – 14 of the specification.) Since the depressurization is performed while the mold is closed, the entire wall surface of the cavity is covered by a releasing agent layer having a uniform thickness,

Serial No. 10/670,502

Attorney Docket No. 26A-010

without staining the work site. In addition, the solvent cleans the wall surface of the cavity at the time of formation of the releasing agent layer

The office action asserts that Bakkelunn discloses the invention as claimed. To the contrary, Bakkelunn fails to teach or suggest the invention, as presently claimed, when the claims are considered as a whole. Bakkelunn fails to teach or suggest, for example, forming of a releasing agent layer on a wall surface or on the surface of a cavity, as further recited. (See, e.g., claim 21, claim 29.) To the contrary, Bakkelunn fails to teach depressurization of a cavity while a mold is closed to form a releasing agent layer on the cavity wall. Rather, Bakkelunn discloses depressurization of a cavity to form a foamed plastic material instead of a releasing agent layer.

Moreover, Bakkelunn fails to teach or suggest the use of a solvent to form a releasing agent layer. Bakkelunn merely discloses some foaming agents such as carbon dioxide (col. 1, lines 27 – 29) sulphonyl hydrazide, and a physical propellant (col. 4, lines 5 – 8). However, Bakkelunn's foaming agent is used to form bubbles when curing (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 8). Therefore the foaming agents disclosed in Bakkelunn are not a solvent. (See claim 21, claim 29.)

For at least these reasons, the combination of features recited in independent claims 21 and 29, when interpreted as a whole, is submitted to patentably distinguish over the references. In addition, Bakkelunn clearly fails to show other recited elements as well.

With respect to the rejected dependent claims, applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable not only by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 21 and 29, but also because of additional features they recite in combination.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as described above, the cited references do not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. Applicants do not concede that the

Serial No. 10/670,502

Attorney Docket No. 26A-010

cited references show any of the elements recited in the claims. However, applicants have provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited references.


Applicants strongly emphasize that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples applicant has described herein in connection with distinguishing over the references as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, applicants have provided examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 23, 26 – 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakkelun in view of Nagasaka. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakkelun in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,768,232, Farber ("Farber"). These dependent claims are deemed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above, and due at least to their dependency from the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



Cynthia K. Nicholson
Reg. No. 36,880

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400